

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are pending.

Claims 1-20 are rejected.

In the final office action dated May 29, 2008, claims 1-5, 10-16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brady U.S. Patent No. 7,114,171 in view of Loui U.S. Patent No. 6,813,618. The '103 rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claims has been amended for clarity, not in response to the '103 rejection. Entry of the after-final amendments is respectfully requested in order to reduce the number of issues for appeal.

Amended claim 1 recites a vehicle seat for supporting a passenger. The seat includes a frame, a video monitor mounted on the seat frame, and a digital processor operatively connected to the video monitor for processing a digital input for display as an image on the video monitor. The digital processor is programmed with image editing software for allowing a passenger to organize and edit any one or more images from the digital input.

Brady discloses an In-Flight Entertainment (IFE) system including a display, processor and user interface. The office action acknowledges that Brady does not teach or suggest an IFE that includes image editing software that allows passengers to edit digital images.

The office action cites a patent to Loui, and alleges that it would be obvious to add image editing software to Brady's IFE system. However, Loui only discloses image editing software. Loui is silent about IFE systems. Loui does not suggest an IFE with image editing software that allows passengers to edit digital images.

A patent to DeLorme has also been made of record. DeLorme does not suggest an IFE with image editing software that allows passengers to edit digital images.

The office action provides no evidence from the PRIOR ART that suggests the use of image editing software in an in-flight entertainment system. The office action does not offer any of the rationales listed in MPEP 2143 for adding image editing software to Brady's IFE system. The office action only offers a rationale provided by the applicant.

Therefore, the office action has not established prima facie obviousness of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-17 should be allowed over Brady and Loui.

Secondary considerations also suggest that claim 1 isn't obvious. Airline companies have long sought ways of keeping passengers occupied during long flights. If adding image editing software to an IFE system was so obvious, then given its advantages, someone would already done it already.

Brady doesn't teach or suggest the various types of entertainment that a passenger could enjoy with image editing software. Brady doesn't teach or suggest editing the passengers own digital images (claim 4), creating a digital travel log (claim 6), editing digital images taken by an externally-mounted aircraft camera (claim 8) or a seat-mounted camera (claim 10), or mixing personal images with content provided by the aircraft (claim 20). For these additional reasons, claims 4, 6, 8, 10 and 20 should be allowed.

Claims 18 should be allowed for the same reasons that claim 1 should be allowed. Claims 19-20 should also be allowed, as they depend from claim 18.

If the Examiner has any questions or wishes to further discuss this application, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hugh Gortler #33,890/

Hugh P. Gortler

Reg. No. 33,890

(949) 454-0898

Date: July 29, 2008